

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 14, 2006.

Claims 1, 3, 21, and 22 are amended; claims 25-27 are added; as a result, claims 1-6 and 21-27 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ken Yap, "Etherboot Developers Manual", v5.01, May 4, 2001 ("Yap"), in view of Leung et al. (U.S. 6,282,647).

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 is amended and recites, among other things, "programming the compressed boot image and programming a decompressor into a boot ROM of the network adapter, wherein the decompressor is to decompress the compressed boot image into the storage device without copying a content of the compressed boot image to the storage device before decompressing the compressed boot image into the storage device".

Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentable over Yap and Leung because Applicant is unable to find in Yap and Leung everything recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Yap and Leung, whether considered individually or in combination, "programming the compressed boot image and programming a decompressor into a boot ROM of the network adapter, wherein the decompressor is to decompress the compressed boot image into the storage device without copying a content of the compressed boot image to the storage device before decompressing the compressed boot image into the storage device". Applicant also believes that Yap and Leung teach different things. Therefore, Applicant cannot find a motivation to combine Yap and Leung, as proposed by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 1. Dependent claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and recite the things of claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 2-6 are also patentable over Yap and Leung, whether considered individually or in combination, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, plus the additional things recited in claims

2-6. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 2-6.

Independent claim 21 is amended and recites, among other things, "a storage device located outside the network adapter and comprising a utility program that when executed on the processor is to compress a boot image for the network adapter into a compressed boot image and program the compressed boot image and a decompressor into a boot ROM of the network adapter, wherein the decompressor is to decompress the compressed boot image into the storage device without copying a content of the compressed boot image to the storage device before decompressing the compressed boot image into the storage device".

Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentable over Yap and Leung because Applicant is unable to find in Yap and Leung everything recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Yap and Leung, whether considered individually or in combination, "a storage device located outside the network adapter and comprising a utility program that when executed on the processor is to compress a boot image for the network adapter into a compressed boot image and program the compressed boot image and a decompressor into a boot ROM of the network adapter, wherein the decompressor is to decompress the compressed boot image into the storage device without copying a content of the compressed boot image to the storage device before decompressing the compressed boot image into the storage device". Applicant also believes that Yap and Leung teach different things. Therefore, Applicant cannot find a motivation to combine Yap and Leung, as proposed by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 1. Dependent claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and recite the things of claim 21. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 22-24 are also patentable over Yap and Leung, whether considered individually or in combination, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 21, plus the additional things recited in claims 22-24. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 22-24.

New Claims

Applicant believes that new claims 25-27 are patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 22-24.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6969) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCOTT P. DUBAL

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date 16 October 2006

By 

Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 16th day of October 2006.

Amy Moriarty
Name


Signature